

246 N. High Street  
Post Office Box 118  
Columbus Ohio 43266-0118

Telephone (614) 466-3543



00000023

GEORGE V. VOINOVICH  
Governor

100071

January 28, 1992

Gina Weber  
Community Relations Coordinator  
Office of Public Affairs  
U.S. EPA (5PA-14)  
230 S. Dearborn  
Chicago, IL 60604

Dear Ms. Weber:

I want to update you on the status of the Health Assessment being conducted for the Skinner Landfill. For your information as well, enclosed is the list of citizens health-related concerns regarding the landfill. Accepted into the landfill were, among other things, a variety of organic and inorganic chemicals. This landfill is on the National Priority List (Superfund) for toxic waste sites. Because the Skinner Landfill is a Superfund site, a health assessment is undertaken in affected communities residing near hazardous waste sites. The goal of the health assessment is to determine if a hazardous waste site is a risk to area residents or to site workers. This is done by reviewing and evaluating site information such as environmental monitoring data (information about the hazardous materials present at the site), determining the environmental and human exposure pathways, reviewing toxicology literature, determining potential health outcomes and soliciting community concerns. The Health Assessment Branch places a high priority on interaction with affected communities. We solicited community concerns at a public involvement meeting on September 26, 1991, at the Union Township public library. The health concerns were recorded and will be incorporated into the health assessment. The list of concerns and responses in the health assessment may be shorter than the enclosed list because of duplication or concerns specific to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or Ohio EPA. The complete list of concerns was sent to both agencies. Obtaining public comment on the health assessment expands the public's involvement in the process and increases our responsiveness to your health concerns.

So you will understand why nine months elapse between the public involvement meeting and the public comment period, I want to briefly describe the health assessment process. After the scientists in the Health Assessment Branch of the Ohio Department of Health review site specific information, the document is sent to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Diseases Registry (ATSDR) for review. ATSDR is the federal agency responsible for state health assessment projects. ATSDR returns the document to us with their comments. The document is then sent to both the U.S. and Ohio EPA for their review and comments. When returned to us, the document is again sent to ATSDR for review by the Health Activities Review Board (HARP) where the materials are finally evaluated for any health studies follow-up. After the HARP


review, the document is sent out for public comment. It may seem that the document is sent to several different agencies for review and comment but this is a necessary step. Different agencies compile different types of information about a particular site. By sending the document to these agencies, our health assessment branch is able to compile a complete "picture" of the site.

Acquiring public comment is usually the last stage of the health assessment process. The Skinner landfill health assessment will be available for ~~public comment in August, 1992~~. An announcement of the documents availability will be placed in your local newspapers. Concerned citizens are encouraged to review this document as well as other site-related materials. These documents are available for review at the Union Township public library, 7900 Cox Road, West Chester.

We appreciate your interest in the Skinner landfill health assessment process and welcome additional questions and concerns. Please send those concerns in writing to:

Ohio Department of Health  
Health Assessment Branch  
Bureau of Epidemiology & Toxicology  
246 N. High Street, 9th floor  
P.O. Box 118  
Columbus, OH 43266-0118

Sincerely,

  
Tracy L. Shelley, M.S.  
Chief  
Health Assessment Branch  
Bureau of Epidemiology & Toxicology  
Ohio Department of Health  
(614) 644-6447

**COMMUNITY HEALTH CONCERNS  
SKINNER LANDFILL**

- 1) Is the State Health Department committed to doing the health assessment and health statistics?
- 2) I feel that all of the remedial investigation has been unsubstantiated by the vital statistic record.
- 3) I have heard from many people about the cancer rates. There have been hot spots identified.
- 4) There used to be better air monitoring. There are now no monitors at all.
- 5) There are several cases of idiopathic juvenile diabetes in the area. The children's diabetic clinic stated that there is a pocket of this type of diabetes.
- 6) I am also concerned about the unusual number of children's suicides.
- 7) The contaminated ground water may affect wells downgradient from the site.
- 8) I think that the parents with children in the school should educate themselves about the risk.
- 9) Has there been any off-site sampling?
- 10) There is one family with children that were tested and a number of heavy metals were found in the blood.
- 11) We hate to have things rushed and not thought through clearly. The risk must be minimized at every step.
- 12) We must let the scientific community do the work. We do not want bigger problems down the road.
- 13) There is a gap in the environmental monitoring data (air and radioactive).
- 14) What about possible exposures during remediation. A lot of people may be exposed.
- 15) The phase III RI is a snapshot in history. Do we evaluate trends or how these data change in time?
- 16) Would residents/citizens have any recourse for any exposures?
- 17) There is no sign to alert people that there is a superfund site. Potential residents need to be informed.

**COMMUNITY HEALTH CONCERNS  
SKINNER LANDFILL**

- 18) I have heard that there is property very near Skinner being cleared for single family dwellings.
- 19) I am concerned about dioxins on site.
- 20) Do we gear the health outcome data to the specific chemicals?
- 21) People are concerned about the possibility of being exposed to airborne contaminants during the clean-up (depending upon which remediation plan is chosen).
- 22) People said that this area in SE Ohio has been presented as a high cancer area. People are concerned, not only about contaminants from the superfund site, but also about additive effects from exposures to other substances that may be producing these high cancer rates.
- 23) They are concerned about increasing respiratory problems, for example in those having chronic bronchitis.
- 24) People are concerned about the air pathways of exposure, especially during remediation.
- 25) They want the air monitored and would especially want this during remediation.
- 26) They are concerned about cancer/intestinal cancer in children playing in the streams coming from the landfill.
- 27) The site is not well marked. People want better markings.
- 28) Because it is not well marked and many people do not know it is a superfund site, people are concerned about children playing in the area and in off-site streams.
- 29) People were highly concerned about the on-site day care facility. They also thought that some children may be playing within feet of the lagoon.
- 30) Several people expressed concern about the Skinner family's health.
- 31) People were also highly concerned that the sign that notifies people that the site is a superfund site has been defaced. They said that the people who bring their children to the day care facility may not know that the landfill is a superfund site.

**COMMUNITY HEALTH CONCERNS  
SKINNER LANDFILL**

- 32) People suggested notifying the FBI, because Skinner is a Federal site, the local sheriff, the local board of health, and other authorities about the sign. They felt that a penalty for defacing the sign might prevent its being defaced.
- 33) Carl M.(?) a union township trustee and member of CARE said that the police could monitor the sign because the site is on federal property. He offered to help. Louise Fabinski said that she might call Sheila Sullivan at the EPA.
- 34) There were elevated toxic chemicals in a private well near the site (this may have belonged to a family named Hancock or Hancocks).
- 35) A woman that lived near the site, said that the water (Barret Rd.) had backed up into her yard several times over a period of time. Later, around 3 years ago, they rerouted the stream in front of her house.
- 36) Her sons would become ill after playing in the yard, or in the water, after it had backed up. The symptoms included headaches, temperature, vomiting, and dehydration. One Easter, other relatives visited and their children also became ill after they played in the area. The boys sometimes played downstream from the site. Her daughter who never played in this area did not have these symptoms, when the boys did.
- 37) She knew of another mother in the neighborhood whose children became ill after playing in the water. They had the same symptoms as her boys.
- 38) About 4.5 years ago the University of Cincinnati found toxic levels of lead and mercury in her boys. She did not know where they could have gotten these levels, except from the landfill. She did not believe they received them from paint or from their household. The boy that had been exposed the most (she at first didn't realize that the boys were becoming ill after playing in the area of possible site runoff) is short and not growing as fast as normal. She was concerned that this might be a symptom of poisoning, also.
- 39) She contacted Representative John Banner and the EPA about this, but no one did anything.
- 40) She also mentioned that there was a bad odor near the creek most of the time (on Barret Rd. East of the site). She said after there had been run-off, there would be a sickeningly sweet odor in the area.

**COMMUNITY HEALTH CONCERNS  
SKINNER LANDFILL**

- 41) An agency took air samples in the area; however, she did not believe these samples were taken properly. She said that the odor was strongest in the valley near the stream, but the people took the air samples on top of the hill.
- 42) She thought that someone should test the Skinners for toxic chemicals.
- 43) Her family had also noticed animals near the stream area that acted abnormally. One raccoon kept trying to enter her house in the daytime around 2:00, a time raccoons are not normally about. They found two other abnormal raccoons. They were told that the raccoons may have been rabid, but no one confirmed this.
- 44) They noticed rats in their barn after the Landfill closed and think they may have come from the landfill.
- 45) They think asbestos had been hauled into the landfill.
- 46) She thought around 7 children attended the day care facility. She thought their parents may not have known it was on a superfund site, because the sign had been defaced. She thought the majority of these children came from a town (Maud or Maudville), where many of the parents may have been poor and uneducated.
- 47) People had once seen an orange cloud that extended from the site to over the school.
- 48) Other concerns include idiopathic juvenile diabetes (of those with no family history), suicide, and cancer (Patty Thomas - CARE).
- 49) The people in West Chester may align themselves more with Cincinnati, than with the local community. They may be more aware of what is in the Cincinnati newspapers.
- 50) One of the people from care said that if we sent them information about our public availability sessions they could hand deliver flyers around the neighborhood to make sure people were informed.
- 51) There were concerns about the odors, dust, etc. around the school during the clean-up period.
- 52) Citizens did not want the presence of the children near the site to be used as a "political football".

**COMMUNITY HEALTH CONCERNS  
SKINNER LANDFILL**

- 53) Citizens also felt that notice of the meetings should be posted in the Post Journal and Community Press the day before the meeting, as well as weeks before in order to remind the public.
- 54) One citizen was concerned about idiopathic (non-inherited) juvenile diabetes, suicides (from CNS depressants), and cancer.
- 55) The area is known as "Sinus Valley" due to high incidence of respiratory problems such as bronchitis.
- 56) There was concern over the possible exposure of school children during the clean-up with either incineration or soil remediation.
- 57) CLEAN members are willing to place flyers on mail boxes to inform the public.
- 58) One citizen was concerned about the health of the Skinner family. She indicated that their mental health may have been compromised due to exposures on the site. She suggested that blood tests be taken from those who live on the site.
- 60) The EPA sign was up less than 24 hours before it was obscured. Is there a penalty for destroying federal property and can it be put back up? The parents bringing their children to the daycare need to be informed that this is a superfund site in order to make an informed decision whether or not to bring their children there.
- 61) There were concerns about children in the neighborhood have gotten sick after playing in the creek. The son of this citizen was found to have high levels of lead and mercury when in the hospital.
- 62) A citizen noticed three "rabid" raccoons on her property that were foaming at the mouth, had seizures, and tried to enter her home. One of the raccoons was taken off for testing, but she never received any results back.
- 63) One of the citizens noticed late night deliveries and bulldozers going at night. Some of the trucks contained asbestos and construction debris. Many of the trucks were covered and looked suspicious. She believes the Skinners need to be tested for toxins.

/SKINNER.CON

electromyograms, limb tremor, and tissue manganese data. Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J. 40(5): 349-353.

U.S. EPA. 1984. Health Assessment Document for Manganese. Final Report. Office of Health and Environmental Assessment, Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office, Cincinnati, OH. EPA 600/8-83-013F.

U.S. EPA. 1990. Interim Methods for Development of Inhalation Reference Concentrations. Office of Health and Environmental Assessment, Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office, Research Triangle Park, NC. EPA/600/8-90/066A. (Review Draft)

-----<<< Manganese >>>-----

#### VI.C. CARCINOGENICITY ASSESSMENT REFERENCES

DiPaolo, J.A. 1964. The potentiation of lymphosarcomas in mice by manganous chloride. Fed. Proc. 23: 393. (Abstract).

Furst, A. 1978. Tumorigenic effect of an organomanganese compound on F344 rats and Swiss albino mice: brief communication. J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 60(5): 1171-1173.

Shimkin, M.B. and G.D. Stoner. 1975. Lung tumors in mice: Application to carcinogenesis bioassay. Adv. Cancer Res. 21: 1-58.

Stoner, G.D., M.B. Shimkin, M.C. Troxell, T.L. Thompson and L.S. Terry. 1976. Test for carcinogenicity of metallic compounds by the pulmonary tumor response in strain A mice. Cancer Res. 36: 1744-1747.

Sunderman, F.W., Jr., T.J. Lau and L.J. Cralley. 1974. Inhibitory effect of manganese upon muscle tumorigenesis by nickel subsulfide. Cancer Res. 34: 92-95.

Sunderman, F.W., Jr., K.S. Kasprzak, P.P. Minghetti, R.M. Maenza, N. Becker, C. Onkelinx and P.J. Goldblatt. 1976. Effects of manganese on carcinogenicity and metabolism of nickel subsulfide. Cancer Res. 36: 1790-1800.

Sunderman, F.W., Jr., M.C. Reid, P.R. Allpass and S.B. Taubman. 1980. Manganese inhibition of sarcoma induction by benzo(a)pyrene in Fischer rats. Proc. Am. Assoc. Cancer Res. 21: 72. (Abstract)

U.S. EPA. 1984. Health Assessment Document for Manganese. Office of Research and Development, Office of Health and Environmental Assessment, Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office, Cincinnati, OH. EPA 600/8-83-013F.

U.S. EPA. 1988. Drinking Water Criteria Document for Manganese. Prepared by the Office of Health and Environmental Assessment, Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office, Cincinnati, OH for the Office of Drinking Water, Washington, DC. ECAO-CIN-D008. (External Review Draft).

Witschi, H.P., P.J. Hakkinen and J.P. Kehrner. 1981. Modification of lung tumor development in A/J mice. Toxicology. 21: 37-45.



-----<<< Manganese >>>-----

VI.D. DRINKING WATER HA REFERENCES

None

---

VII. REVISION HISTORY

Substance Name -- Manganese  
CASRN -- 7439-96-5

Date	Section	Description
09/26/88	II.	Carcinogen summary on-line
09/01/89	VI.	Bibliography on-line
06/01/90	I.A.	Oral RfD now under review
08/01/90	I.A.	Oral RfD summary on-line
08/01/90	II.	Text edited
08/01/90	VI.	Oral RfD references added
09/01/90	I.B.	Inhalation RfC now under review
12/06/90	I.B.	Inhalation RfC on-line
12/06/90	VI.B.	Inhalation RfC references added

---

SYNONYMS

Substance Name -- Manganese  
CASRN -- 7439-96-5  
Last Revised -- 09/26/88

7439-96-5  
COLLOIDAL MANGANESE  
MAGNACAT  
MANGAN  
Manganese  
MANGAN NITRIDOVANY  
TRONAMANG

- Drown, D.B., S.G. Oberg and R.P. Sharma. 1986. Pulmonary clearance of soluble and insoluble forms of manganese. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health.* 17: 201-212.
- Emara, A.M., S.H. El-Ghawabi, O.I. Madkour and G.H. El-Sarma. 1971. Chronic manganese poisoning in the dry battery industry. *Br. J. Ind. Med.* 28: 78-82.
- Flinn, R.H., P.A. Neal and W.B. Fulton. 1941. Industrial manganese poisoning. *J. Ind. Hyg. Toxicol.* 23: 374-387.
- Iregren, A. 1990. Psychological test performance in foundry workers exposed to low levels of manganese. *Neurotox. Teratol.* 12: (in press).
- Kesic, B. and V. Hausler. 1954. Hematological investigation on workers exposed to manganese dust. *Arch. Ind. Hyg. Occup. Med.* 10: 336-343.
- Lauwerys, R., H. Roels, P. Genet et al. 1985. Fertility of male workers exposed to mercury vapor or to manganese dust: A questionnaire study. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 7: 171-176.
- Lloyd-Davies, T.A. 1946. Manganese pneumonitis. *Br. J. Ind. Med.* 3: 111-135.
- Lloyd-Davies, T.A. and H.E. Harding. 1949. Manganese pneumonitis. Further clinical and experimental observations. *Br. J. Ind. Med.* 6: 82-90.
- Maigetter, R.Z., R. Ehrlich, J.D. Fenters and D.E. Gardner. 1976. Potentiating effects of manganese dioxide on experimental respiratory infections. *Environ. Res.* 11: 386-91.
- Massaro, E.J., R.B. D'Agostino, C. Stineman, J.B. Marganti and B.A. Lown. 1980. Alterations in behavior of adult offspring of female mice exposed to MnO<sub>2</sub> dust during gestation. *Fed. Proc. Fed. Am. Soc. Exp. Biol.* 39: 623. (Abstr.)
- Mena, I., K. Horiuchi, K. Burke and G.C. Cotzias. 1969. Chronic manganese poisoning: Individual susceptibility and absorption of iron. *Neurology.* 19: 1000-1006.
- Moore, W., D. Hysell, R. Miller et al. 1975. Exposure of laboratory animals to atmospheric manganese from automotive emissions. *Environ. Res.* 9: 274-284.
- Morganti, J.B., B.A. Lown, C.H. Stineman, R.B. D'Agostino and E.J. Massaro. 1985. Uptake, distribution and behavioral effects of inhalation exposure to manganese (manganese dioxide) in the adult mouse. *Neurotoxicology.* 6(1): 1-16.
- Newland, M.C., C. Cox, R. Hamada, G. Oberdorster and B. Weiss. 1987. The clearance of manganese chloride in the primate. *Fund. Appl. Toxicol.* 9: 314-328.
- Nishiyama, K., Y. Suzuki, N. Fujii, H. Yano, T. Miyai and K. Ohmishi. 1975. Effect of long-term inhalation of manganese dusts. II. Continuous observation of the respiratory organs of monkeys and mice. *Jpn. J. Hyg.* 30(1): 117.

Nogawa, K., E. Kobayashi, M. Sakamoto et al. 1973. Epidemiological studies on disturbance of respiratory system caused by manganese air pollution. Report 1: Effects on respiratory system of junior high school students. Jpn. J. Pub. Health. 20: 315-326. (Jap.)

Perl, D.P. and P.F. Good. 1987. Uptake of aluminum into central nervous system along nasal-olfactory pathways. The Lancet. May 2: 1028.

Rodier, J. 1955. Manganese poisoning in Moroccan miners. Br. J. Ind. Med. 12: 21-35.

Roels, H., R. Lauwerys, J.P. Buchet et al. 1987. Epidemiological survey among workers exposed to manganese: Effects on lung, central nervous system, and some biological indices. Am. J. Ind. Med. 11(3): 307-328.

Saric, M. and O. Hrustic. 1975. Exposure to airborne manganese and arterial blood pressure. Environ. Res. 10: 314-318.

Saric, M. and S. Lucic-Palaic. 1977. Possible synergism of exposure to airborne manganese and smoking habit in occurrence of respiratory symptoms. In: Inhaled Particles, IV, W.H. Walton, Ed. Pergamon Press, New York. p. 773-779.

Saric, M., A. Markicevic and O. Hrustic. 1977. Occupational exposure to manganese. Br. J. Ind. Med. 34: 114-118.

Schuler, P., H. Oyanguren, V. Maturana et al. 1957. Manganese poisoning. Environmental and medical study at a Chilean mine. Ind. Med. Surg. 26: 167-173.

Shiotsuka, R.N. 1984. Inhalation toxicity of manganese dioxide and a magnesium oxide-manganese dioxide mixture. GRAI. 85(7): 34.

Smyth, L.T., R.C. Ruhf, N.E. Whitman and T. Dugan. 1973. Clinical manganism and exposure to manganese in the production and processing of ferro-manganese alloy. J. Occup. Med. 15: 101-109.

Suzuki, Y., N. Fujii, H. Yano, T. Ohkita, A. Ichikawa and K. Nishiyama. 1978. Effects of the inhalation of manganese dioxide dust on monkey lungs. Tokushima J. Exp. Med. 25: 119-125.

Tanaka, S. and J. Lieben. 1969. Manganese poisoning and exposure in Pennsylvania. Arch. Environ. Health. 19: 674-684.

Ulrich, C.E., W. Rinehart and W. Busey. 1979a. Evaluation of the chronic inhalation toxicity of a manganese oxide aerosol: I. Introduction, experimental design, and aerosol generation methods. Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J. 40(3): 239-244.

Ulrich, C.E., W. Rinehart, W. Busey and M.M.A. Dorato. 1979b. Evaluation of the chronic inhalation toxicity of a manganese oxide aerosol: II. Clinical observations, hematology, clinical chemistry and histopathology. Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J. 40(4): 322-329.

Ulrich, C.E., W. Rinehart and M. Brandt. 1979c. Evaluation of the chronic inhalation toxicity of a manganese oxide aerosol: III. Pulmonary function,